Spring 2014

Hesitant Inclusion: The Development of the Tidewater Gentry's Process of Political Integration in the Blue Ridge

Sierra Bazor
University of Colorado Boulder

University of Colorado Boulder

Hesitant Inclusion:
The Development of The Tidewater Gentry's Process of Political Integration in the Blue Ridge

Sierra Bazor
Department of History

Defended April 9, 2014

Thesis Advisor:
Dr. Virginia Anderson, Department of History

Defense Committee:
Dr. Virginia Anderson, Department of History
Dr. John Willis, Department of History
Dr. Paul Strom, The Honors Program

Abstract

From 1720 through 1738 the government of Virginia created settlements along the Blue Ridge Mountains and Shenandoah Valley as a part of their pursuit for western expansion of the backcountry. Non-English settlers in this region were slow to receive political inclusion through local county structures. This thesis explains that the tentative introduction of county creation into the Blue Ridge was the result of the slow development of Tidewater gentry interest in the region. It will demonstrate that as land speculation in the backcountry became more lucrative, and as threats that could compromise these new opportunities increased, the Virginia government became more willing to extend political inclusion to the settlements. This will be proven through an examination of legislative journals, personal letters, wills, and legal cases as the Blue Ridge went through the creation of three counties: Spotsylvania, Orange, and Augusta. The development of the whole backcountry can be better understood if the method of political inclusion in the Blue Ridge is examined.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Nestled between the Tidewater and Appalachian Mountains there lies a stretch of land that, from 1720-1738, would struggle for admission into Virginia's political community. The Blue Ridge Mountains themselves are the center of the region. These mountains, along with the Shenandoah Valley to the west and the Piedmont region to the east, make up the Blue Ridge Region. (Figure 1) In a colony that has become known for its accessible style of county government, inhabitants of the Blue Ridge experienced a much slower political integration that set them apart from backcountry settlers of the 1740s. As one of the first examples of significant western migration in Virginia, the Blue Ridge served as an experiment in settlement, which would shape the process of county creation, and thus government accessibility, for the later frontier.

Much recent scholarship dealing with the Virginia frontier has been focused on either the development of settlements after 1738, or on the demographics of the settlements. Robert Mitchell, Edmund Morgan, and John Frantz provide excellent insight into the complexity of settlement in the Blue Ridge.[1] They depict success of westward settlement as a complicated balance between dominant English Tidewater society and the often foreign culture of backcountry settlers. These settlers were primarily German or Scots-Irish and did not share the same economy, religion, or community as the plantation owners who ran Virginia. Of course,

---

[1] Robert D. Mitchell, "Shenandoah Valley Frontier," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 62, no. 3 (September, 1972): 461-486.
Robert D.Mitchell, *Commercialism and Frontier: Perspectives on the Early Shenandoah Valley* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1977).
Edmund S. Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom,* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2003).
John B. Frantz, "The Religious Development of the Early German Settlers in 'Greater Pennsylvania': The Shenandoah Valley of Virginia," *Pennsylvania History* 68, no. 1, Pennsylvania Germans, Part One (Winter, 2001): 66-100.

the complex culture clash between the Tidewater gentry and immigrant settlers must be understood before any conclusions can be made about why these planters hesitated in creating western county government; however, it would be a mistake to focus primarily on the differences in culture without giving a careful examination to the personal interests the gentry developed in the region. After all, the very gentry that were hesitant to provide county government when Blue Ridge was settled in 1720 were actively involved in 1738 when they presented an act in the House of Burgesses to create the county of Augusta.[2] Without an understanding of both the cultural differences and the increase in the gentry's personal interests, there is a danger of oversimplification in explaining the sluggish development of counties in the region.

Perhaps two of the better scholars working on the subject of county creation and the Virginia backcountry are Richard Beeman and Warren Hofstra. Beeman has offered a careful examination of both political life and country creation.[3] His *Evolution of the Southern Backcountry* is a case study on the county of Lunenburg first established in 1748. This case study follows the interactions among German, Scots-Irish, and Irish Virginian settlers and the gentry, which made the backcountry unique. In *Varieties of the Political Experience,* Beeman identifies the backcountry as a place with a different political experience than the rest of Virginia. Again, Beeman focuses primarily on the economic and social differences that shaped backcountry settlements in the late 1740s through 1760s.[4] He identifies the contrast between the gentry's willingness to provide accessible county government in the southern backcountry with their hesitation to provide the same services in the Blue Ridge. This identification fails to make

---

[2] William Waller Hening, *The Statutes at Large; Being a Collection of All of the Laws of Virginia, From the First Session of the Legislature in the year 1619,* 5 Vols. (Richmond: Franklin Press, 1819), 5:76-78.
[3] Richard Beeman, *The Evolution of the Southern Backcountry,* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984). Richard Beeman, *The Varieties of the Political Experience in Eighteenth Century America,* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.)
[4] Beeman, *Varieties of the Political Experience,* 159-165.

a conclusion as to why this contrast existed. County creation in the backcountry must be understood as a process, and the principle reason for this process is the assertion of control on the part of the gentry.

Warren Hofstra's extensive body of work provides the best research available as to the reason for hesitant county creation in the Blue Ridge. Hofstra's *Planting of New Virginia* provides a detailed account of settlement in the Blue Ridge.[5] This research includes such topics as the role ethnicity played in the development of the region, the economic development of a community-based settlement, the land policies that would populate the region, and the conflict that arose from that population. Hofstra's work begins much closer to the creation of Spotsylvania, the first county in the Blue Ridge in 1720, than Beeman; however, he only deals briefly with the early history of this first county in the Blue Ridge, and thus fails to recognize its importance. It has been suggested by some, including Hofstra, that settlements were created in the Blue Ridge primarily for the purpose of protecting the Tidewater against the threat of French and Indian attacks.[6] Under this assumption, the slowness in county creation was the result of creating a buffer zone of settlers that were disconnected with Tidewater Virginia. This assumption fails to account for the passion that Alexander Spotswood, Governor of Virginia at the time of Spotsylvania's creation, had for settlement creation in the Blue Ridge before these defensive issues had fully developed.

My thesis argues that it is these early years of Blue Ridge settlement that were most important to county creation. A careful examination of the process of county creation within the Blue Ridge between 1720 and 1738 indeed will demonstrate, as historians have argued, that differences between settlers and gentry, as well as a need for defense, slowed backcountry

[5] Warren R. Hofstra, *The Planting of New Virginia, Settlement and Landscape in the Shenandoah Valley,* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2006).
[6] Ibid., 41-47, 56-58, 60-62.

development. My thesis adds an additional factor with its exploration of individual gentry interests in development. The basis of this argument will be found in the letters and writings of various leaders, such as Lieutenant Governor Alexander Spotswood, William Byrd, and William Beverley, as well as the records of the House of Burgesses, Governor's Council, and the General Assembly.

As their personal interests in the Blue Ridge began to increase, gentry gradually became motivated to integrate settlers into the Virginian political community through county creation. Since the Blue Ridge was the first major western expansion for Virginia, the gentry used the region to develop a system of county creation that would ensure their continued influence, and yet simultaneously encouraged growth in these difficult regions. This plan included the encouragement of diversity along the frontier, the placement of gentry families around these new settlements, and the partnership between private and government sponsored speculation.

Two important stages marked the process of county creation in the Blue Ridge. First, so long as the settlers were relegated to a single large county—Spotsylvania—they became more insulated within their communities. As a result they were less likely to demonstrate a loyalty to Virginia and its distant government, which can be seen in their petitions and responses to militia calls by the colony. Second, after the establishment of Augusta County, the gentry who dominated Virginia's government began a more aggressive campaign to settle and expand the backcountry and more quickly establish western counties. This was able to occur because the initial slow Blue Ridge taught the gentry a lesson that would later allow county creation to occur more quickly. The Blue Ridge experience was the key to western expansion that would boom in the 1740s through 1760s. It allowed the gentry to see the possibilities in western expansion, and gave them the tools for integration through proper county creation. This early history is vital to

the understanding of Virginian government in the backcountry. Blue Ridge inhabitants were a part of the creation of the colonial government, through their long and often hard fought campaign for access to county courts.

Figure 1: A map of the most inhabited part of Virginia containing the whole province of Maryland with part of Pennsylvania, New Jersey and North Carolina. 1755. Courtesy of the Library of Congress.

Chapter One

A Speech

Governor Alexander Spotswood stood before a hostile General Assembly on November 3, 1720 armed with an ambitious plan to create counties along the Blue Ridge Mountains of the frontier of Virginia. This region stretched along the western frontier of Virginia and extended over the Blue Ridge Mountains, into the Shenandoah Valley. He proposed the creation of settlements in the region, which were to be inhabited by Scotch-Irish and German immigrants from Pennsylvania, who could later be integrated into Virginian society. At the time of this proposal Spotswood had few allies in the Assembly, as charges of corruption were sent to England against both parties. His speech to these Virginian members needed to simultaneously assert his authority, and persuade them of the importance of a region in which they had no personal interest.

Colonel Alexander Spotswood arrived in Virginia in 1710, commissioned to serve as the Lieutenant Governor for Virginia. He quickly set himself apart from his predecessors through policy aimed at the restoration of royal authority over the Council. The Council had slowly eroded the ability of the governor to accomplish any policy that was in contrast to the interests of the Virginian elite, of which they were members.[1] These council members controlled the purse

[1] Robert Beverley, *The History of Virginia, in Four Parts*, 2nd ed. (Richmond, VA: H.K. Ellysons Steam Press, 1855), 71-76.
Jack P. Greene, "The Opposition to Lieutenant Governor Alexander Spotswood 1718," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 70, no.1, Part One (Jan., 1962): 35-36.

strings of the colony and had utilized the Virginian practice of county courts to alleviate much of the influence of both the House of Burgesses and the Governor himself. The House of Burgesses was the representative body of legislation in Virginia; the Council by contrast was not elected, but was appointed. Over the years prior to Governor Spotswood's appointment, the Council had managed to erode most of the power held by House of Burgesses, and thus the two spent years in dispute. Upon the arrival of Spotswood to the colony, the Council found itself in an alliance with the Burgesses that would allow the House to regain some authority and the Council to maintain its hold over the governor.[2] If a governor hoped to succeed in Virginia he would now have to play by the Assembly's rules.

Members of the Assembly and Council would have preferred Governor Spotswood to focus on the tobacco industry or trade in ports; instead, he fixed his gaze west with the goal of expanding revenue for the crown through trade and land consumption. As a result, he quickly found himself an enemy of most plantation owners who controlled the colony. William Byrd, a member of the Council, acknowledged his distrust of Spotswood in one of his numerous complaints to the Lords Commission of Trade and Plantations. In this complaint he relayed his fear of Spotswood's attempt to assign judges to a new Court of Oyer and Terminer in Virginia. Byrd warned that Governors were not infallible, subject to the temptation of greed and favoritism; therefore they needed to be limited. After all, a Governor "can't appoint so much a Justice of the Peace… without the advice of the Council," and the majority of the Assembly agreed that this limit of authority should remain.[3] The creation of counties, which would include

---

[2] On the history of the how the Council asserted its authority over previous governors see Robert Beverley, *History of Virginia,* 69-76.
On the alliance between the House of Burgesses and the Council see Jack P. Greene, "Opposition to Spotswood," 36.

[3] William Byrd to Lord Commissioners of Trade and Plantations, 1718, *Calendar of Virginia State Papers and Other Manuscripts 1652-1781*, ed. WM. P. Palmer (Richmond,1875), 191.

a non-English demographic, was not high on the priority of the Assembly. For Spotswood, development of the Blue Ridge became an important aspect of his legacy.

Seeds of Spotswood's ambition for westward expansion may have been sown when he led an expedition of several Virginians, known as the Knights of the Golden Horseshoe, across the frontier to the top of the Blue Ridge in August of 1716.[4] From the peaks of the Blue Ridge Mountains, Governor Spotswood saw the future of Virginia, believing he had reached the peak that led to the Great Lakes. Even though the Great Lakes were not as close to Virginia as Spotswood originally hoped, he was correct in his assessment of the prosperity that would come to the colony through land expansion. This expedition included one of his few Virginian allies, Robert Beverley, a man whose family would be granted 118,491 acres within the Blue Ridge on another hot August twenty years later in 1736.[5] In his *History of Virginia*, Beverley describes his friend as being a visionary for the colony. Beverley wrote, "He, to the extraordinary benefit of this country, still continues governor, having improved it beyond imagination."[6] Beverley and Spotswood recognized the undeveloped land in the Blue Ridge as the key to control of the west. An increased presence in the region would ensure control of Indian trade, secure the Shenandoah Valley from French encroachment, and allow Virginia to partake in lucrative land grabs like Pennsylvania to the north.

Commitment to the development of the Blue Ridge extended beyond just a policy of settlement. In an effort to bolster profits for himself and the British Empire, Governor Spotswood created the Virginia Indian Trade Company, which effectively held a monopoly over

---

[4] John Walter Wayland, "The Germans of the Valley," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 9, no. 4 (Apr., 1902):346.
[5] Edward Aull, *Early History of Staunton and Beverley Manor in Augusta County, Virginia.* The Rucker Agee Collection. Sykesville, MD: Bayside Books of Maryland, 1963. 1-5.
[6] Beverley, *History of Virginia*, 89.

trade along the western frontier from 1714 until 1718.[7] This company eliminated most private investors, including William Byrd. As part of their efforts to control trade, the company built Fort Christanna as the sole trade post in the region to be controlled by the Virginia Indian Trade Company. In a letter to the Lord of Commissions and Trade in 1714 Spotswood describes how he got the Indian Trade Act that allowed the Trade Company's monopoly passed for the betterment of the colony.[8] He believed that through the act and the Fort, Indian Schools would be built, settlements would be erected that could make Virginia's borders more safe, and fraudulent trade practices would be eliminated.[9] Spotswood spoke very highly of his act in an attempt to get a royal of approval for the plan, something that is echoed in his letter to the Bishop of London.[10] Perhaps this is because he realizes that men like Byrd would only become more hostile as their financial interests in the frontier became endangered. After all, Byrd and other elite landowners could have seen this as yet another way to limit their access to business along the frontier.

Most of the Virginian elite were in opposition to Governor Spotswood, and there is no greater example of this powerful class than William Byrd II. Byrd was a wealthy plantation owner who was a part of the new power structure in Virginia. This power came from the political control they exerted in the Council, and is exemplified in the control they had over

---

[7] Jack P. Greene, "Opposition to Spotswood," 35-36.
[8] Lieutenant Governor Alexander Spotswood to Lords Commissioners of Trade on January 27, 1714 in *The Official Letters of Alexander Spotswood, Lieutenant Governor of the colony of Virginia, 1710-1722,* ed. R.A. Brock (Richmond: WM Ellis Jones Printer, 1923), 93-96.
[9] Warren R Hofstra, *The Planting of New Virginia, Settlement and Landscape in the Shenandoah Valley,* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2004), 58-59.
[10] Lieutenant Governor Alexander Spotswood to Lords Commissioners of Trade on January 27, 1714 in *Letters of Spotswood,* 92-93.

Tidewater society. Membership into this group was achieved through the successful cultivation of tobacco, and, perhaps more importantly, through the acquisition of massive tracts of land.[11] Members of this elite class were able to influence legislation as they continued to amass economic power. This allowed them to further their influence and simultaneously erode the influence of anyone outside of their group. Spotswood, considered an outsider from England, clashed with Byrd as he attempted to regain some political capability within Virginia. Whoever controlled the legislation of Virginia also controlled the vision for the colony. Two men could not have had more different visions for Virginia's future.

Byrd believed Spotswood would destroy the society he had so proudly helped foster. To Byrd, Spotswood could not be trusted. Spotswood proved this in a policy over land purchases. Soon after his arrival in Virginia, Spotswood lifted the ban on land grants of over 1,000 acres, which would allow Byrd and other elite to buy large tracts of land that they would in turn sell or develop.[12] This was legislation favorable to the wealthy land owners who could now speculate more freely in the backcountry. It was also favorable to Spotswood's attempt to excite interest in the Blue Ridge. At the time Spotswood unveiled his plans for the frontier, Byrd was attempting to settle his own large tracts of land along the southern frontier.[13] Yet this generous land policy did not make Byrd look more favorably on Spotswood. Part of this disdain was the result of business Spotswood took from Byrd on the frontier through his Indian Trade Law. Another reason was that the dissolution of limits in land acquisition was followed with an attempt by Spotswood to require landowners to cultivate three acres of land for every fifty owned, which

---

[11] T.H. Breen, *Tobacco Culture*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 35-37.
[12]Robert D. Mitchell, "Shenandoah Valley Frontier," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 62, no. 3 (Sept., 1972): 466.
[13] Richard R Beeman, *The Varieties of the Political Experience in Eighteenth Century America*, 2004. Reprint, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 14-24.

limited the ability to speculate that had been presented in his prior legislation.[14] Spotswood's use of his royal authority affected the economic success of the Virginian elite, and made him many enemies in the Assembly. For Byrd, this royal authority diminished the success of his personal interests in the frontier, and while Spotswood was enamored with the Blue Ridge, Byrd had no interest in this particular section of the backcountry. Through the elimination of this land limit, Spotswood contributed to the desire to preserve self-interest in the Council and the House of Burgesses, which prohibited him from the accomplishment of political reform within the colony.

Under the political structure of eighteenth century Virginia, self-interest, or a lack thereof, was a notable contributor to legislative decisions. Settlements within the Blue Ridge were greatly affected by this reality. If the majority of men disagreed with Spotswood, either with his land policy or with him as a person, the legislation needed to pursue land expansion would not have a chance. Unlike Spotswood, Byrd never sought a foothold in the Blue Ridge. He was, however, vocal in the promotion of his own attempts at land expansion in the southern parts of the Virginia backcountry.[15] Since he had no interest in the expansion or development of the Blue Ridge, he was hesitant to allow the formation of local government in the region. In fact, Byrd was vocal against the petitions of inhabitants in the region that asked for smaller counties and closer courts even after settlements were established in the Blue Ridge.[16] Since Byrd had no land or other immediate economic ties to the Blue Ridge, he had no motivation to encourage extensive development of the land. For Byrd, even if settlements were established, they would never be integrated into his Virginian society.

---

[14] Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom,* 359.
[15] William Byrd, *The London Diary, 1717-1721, and other writings,* ed Louis B. Wright and Marion Tinling (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958), 55.
[16] William Byrd in *Calendar of Virginia State Papers,* 24.

So Spotswood stood cautiously before the Assembly in 1720, and prepared to give a speech that would define his land policy for the remainder of his tenure as Governor. His task was to convince enough of the Assembly to pass an Act to create counties that would develop a region he had taken a special interest in. He would have to convince the Assembly of its importance, not just to the colony as whole or the success of the crown, but to them as individuals. Only then could he overcome the opposition that he faced at every turn from enemies like William Byrd.

Spotswood began his speech with a request for unity. He stated that:

> if some vulgar notions are to prevail, as if the body ought to thwart and oppose the head, our sessions must prove nothing better than a burthen to the people, and that invidious distinction of *Country* and *Governor's Friends,* which I am sorry to observe some men have be endustrious still to keep up, must prove a poison to your proceedings, if you suffer it to take place in your consultations.[17]

In this statement, Spotswood acknowledged the division in Virginia politics between the Governor, with his authority from the crown, and the elite, with their authority from representation. According to Spotswood, if the legislative body attempted to act without the head it would make the colony suffer; a body cannot make reasoned decisions without the head. For Spotswood, this was a subtle reminder of his place in the colony, but was carefully crafted to demonstrate the need for the two parties to work together. He believed that the root of this "poison" went deeper than corrupt officials; it went into the process itself. Virginia possessed one of the more progressive voter requirements in the Americas: be a freeman and possess one

[17] "Governour Spotswood's Speech to the Assembly of Virginia, November, 3 1720" *The American Weekly Mercury*, (Jan. 31 1721), American Newspapers Database.

hundred acres of land.[18] This created more voters, and these voters continued to elect the elite to the House of Burgesses. Of course, this was another cause of concern within the system for Spotswood. Many elite members were elected as representatives of counties they did not reside in since they could run in any county where they were land owners, which allowed them to run in counties where they had substantial economic influence.[19] Since the Blue Ridge did not have an active elite member in its region, the assembly was cautious in the creation of counties where a representative not acquainted with Virginia politics could be elected to serve with the tobacco gentry. In fact, the idea of outsiders in the House of Burgesses was cause for suspicion; how could an outsider possibly understand the complex interests of a tobacco economy? Spotswood would have to do more than simply implore unity between royal authority and colonial interests.

Next, Spotswood attempted to dismiss the idea that he was an outsider with no interests in the colony. He did this first through a reassertion of his authority, and second through a declaration of shared interests. Spotswood may have been from England, but he did have a sincere connection with the land along the Blue Ridge. After his service as Governor he moved to Germanna, where he was an active member of Virginia, as seen throughout the Assembly's journals.[20] Even though he did have a personal investment in the region, he had to assert himself first as an extension of royal authority over a British colony. He said that "our duty engages us governors to be especially mindful of Great Britain's interest, yet I cannot see why that may not go hand in hand with the prosperity of the plantations."[21] Here, Spotswood reminded the Assembly that he had a duty to run the colony as an extension of Great Britain first and foremost, but that the two interests should be the same. This olive branch was an attempt by Spotswood to

---

[18] Richard R. Beeman, *The Varieties of the Political Experience in Eighteenth Century America*, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 49.
[19] Ibid., 49-50.
[20] *Legislative Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia,* 2: 74, 78.
[21] "Spotswood's Speech," *The American Weekly Mercury*.

calm the fears of an intrusion of outsiders that would undermine plantation interests. In fact, the two should be intertwined "as living under the Marriage Compact," where Great Britain was the groom and Virginia the dutiful bride.[22] Spotswood attempted to convince the Assembly that they were not enemies and that, as representatives of the crown, they were in fact partners.

Finally, Spotswood entered the final quarter of his speech, and sought to prove why the Blue Ridge was vital to the interest of those in the Assembly. Spotswood based his land propositions on security. He asked the Assembly to consider their inability to fight along the frontier through fortifications and militia. Then he asked, "whether the giving encouragement for extending your out settlements to the high ridge of the mountains will not be laying hold of the best barrier that nature could form to secure this colony from the incursions of the Indians, and more dangerous encroachments of the French."[23] This statement made the extension of settlements and county creation a military operation. If the elite were worried about outsiders, Spotswood gave them fear of someone even further outside their circle to think about. His use of fear as persuasion was effective on both the Assembly and officials in London.

Some historians have used this statement by Spotswood as a proof of his attempt to create a buffer zone that would protect the colony from the violence that seemed to capture the frontier of neighboring colonies.[24] To some extent, this was one part of Spotswood's plan to secure safer relations with the Indians who were in contact with the frontier region; however, Spotswood's attempts to persuade officials within Great Britain and Virginia must be read alongside his own accounts of the region. When properly paired, Spotswood's vision for western expansion can be seen as a means of securing the border, and as a way to develop a region he saw as a key to the future. A seed of this plan can be seen at the close of his speech. After an attempt to portray the

[22] Ibid.
[23] Ibid.
[24] Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia*, 64-68, 77-81.

frontier as a dangerous place with hostile Indian forces, he stated that the Lords of Commissioners of Trade and Plantations had approved a treaty with the Five Nations of the Northern Indians.[25] This was a treaty Spotswood helped design that would require a passport to be acquired through the Governor's office before an Indian could travel throughout the frontier from Virginia to New York.[26] It also prohibited any Frenchman from accompanying an Indian party through the region. This treaty was approved by the Commissioners of Trade and would soon be finalized between all parties. The very inclusion of this treaty seems to contradict the security issues he had just raised; perhaps Spotswood attempted to give this as a reason for approval of his act to landowners who might take interest in the region. Its inclusion is certainly more consistent with Spotswood's vision for economic development and stability in the region.

One thing absent in Spotswood's speech was the mention of neighboring westward expansion. As a negotiator between colonies and Indian tribes, he witnessed the increased colonial presence in the west, particularly from Pennsylvania. In fact, the simultaneous attempts of Spotswood to create some peace on the frontier for Virginia and expand its borders may have been in response to the conflict he saw in the region. As one of Virginia's more aggressive competitors in western settlement, Pennsylvania settlers became a target for Spotswood, who was eager to spark their migration into the Blue Ridge. Pennsylvania's governor was skeptical of the new treaty with the Five Nations of the Northern Indians. It seemed to protect the other colonies as they developed their backcountry, but did not aid a Pennsylvanian frontier that had expanded west quickly into close proximity to tribal lands.[27] If Spotswood understood, and helped develop, the politics of westward expansion, why did Spotswood leave out colonial

---

[25] Spotswood's Speech, *The American Weekly Mercury*.
[26] William Keith, "To His Excellency, Col Spotswood, Governor of Virginia, the Memorial of William Keith, Governor of Pennsylvania," *Pennsylvania Gazette*. April 1721, American Newspapers Database.
[27] Ibid.

competition in his address to the house? On the southern border, Byrd appeared to be engaged in colonial competition. He sought to expand his land along North Carolina. In addition, the Carter family held land along the border of Pennsylvania in northern Virginia. Yet the only family that had expressed real interest in the region to the west was the Beverleys, who were still not actively speculating in the region. Even Lord Fairfax who held the Northern Neck, an area in the Blue Ridge that would later become entangled in legal battles due to its popularity, let his land sit untouched. Virginians had not yet felt the pressure to compete with their neighbors for land. Spotswood understood that and left it out of his address in order to pursue more persuasive means.

After Spotswood gave his speech before the Assembly, the members began to debate the policy that was laid before them. On Friday, November 4, a response was sent to the Governor which was filled with political posturing and expressions of loyalty.[28] There was no objection to the development of better security through settlement of the Blue Ridge. That very month, the House passed an act that would create two counties in the western frontier: Brunswick and Spotsylvania.[29] Spotsylvania would include Germanna, all of the Blue Ridge, and any potential land west. In between the speech and the act there was a compromise. Spotswood would get settlements in the west; however, only two counties were created, not enough to initiate a real integration into Virginian society. This ensured that the members of the Assembly would continue to govern Virginia in the manner they had grown accustomed to. Without smaller counties the chance of Scots-Irish, or German representatives reaching the House could be

[28] *Journals of the Council,* 47.
[29] Hening, *The Statutes at Larg,*

controlled. This would continue to be the political philosophy towards the backcountry for the next decade. Spotswood made settlement possible in the Blue Ridge, but was not able to see its integration into Virginian society.

Chapter 2

The Business of Settlement

Spotswood's attempt to unite the Assembly on the issue of the Blue Ridge settlement was a success and the county of Spotsylvania was created. In order to pursue this new land policy, the Assembly accepted Spotswood's proposal to recruit non-English settlers into the Blue Ridge frontier.[1] Spotsylvania would have its courthouse in Germanna, a successful German community already established along the eastern boundary of this new county. The success found through the creation of Spotsylvania was followed by complications in settlement. These complications included the placement of settlers considered vastly different from the gentry and tense relations with Indian groups along the frontier. These were some of the reasons that settlers desired access to local government, but for those same reasons the gentry denied the inhabitants this opportunity. Inaction by Virginia leadership on these issues, as well as their refusal to create smaller counties in the region, was symptomatic of their insular values and legislation.

The Virginia backcountry was rich in diversity; diversity in ethnicity, diversity in religion, diversity in environment, and diversity in economy. In the backcountry outside of the Blue Ridge, immigrants with different ethnic backgrounds settled the region alongside Virginians.[2] This exposed the settlers to the cultural values of the Tidewater, and allowed the backcountry to become an extension of the plantation mentality. Integration of native Virginians

[1] Hening, *Statutes at Large,* 71.
[2] Charles J Farmer, *In the Absence of Towns: Settlement and Country Trade in Southside Virginia, 1730-1800,* (Lanham, MD: Rowaman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.: 1993), 35-39.

and non-English settlers enabled the gentry to assert their influence over the region; an action that would make accessible local government less threatening. This was especially true during the late 1730s and 1740s in the southern frontier along the Carolina-Virginia boundary, where William Byrd and other wealthy plantation owners were influential.[3] Areas that lay closer to eastern Virginia were suitable places for wealthy land owners to send their children, or to sell to other Virginians who desired to pursue the tobacco driven gentry culture. [4] This enabled the gentry to ensure the development of frontier as an extension of the values of the Tidewater. As a result, smaller counties developed faster in other parts of the backcountry than in the Blue Ridge.

One reason gentry were unable to find the same level of success in the development of the Blue Ridge as they did in other parts of the backcountry was the isolation of this region. This region stretched across the north western frontier along the foot of the Appalachian mountain range. The "Ridge", or Blue Ridge Mountains, acted as a barrier between the frontier of the Shenandoah Valley and the established eastern Virginia. In fact, the only way to reach the valley was to navigate one of only two passes: "Swift Run Gap" and "Rock 'ish Gap."[5] It was through the Swift Run Gap that the goal of western expansion was conceived, when Governor Spotswood led his Knights of the Golden Horseshoe expedition.[6]

It was this isolation that prohibited the Tidewater culture from trickling into the area. Without an ability to assimilate, the inhabitants of the Blue Ridge would have no reason to uphold the Assembly members' interests after county creation. Simply put, if smaller counties allowed the settlers to be represented in government without the influence of the gentry, there would be a danger that these backcountry representatives would thwart the interests of wealthy

[3] Beeman, *Southern Backcountry*,14-15.
[4] T.H. Breen, *Tobacco Culture,* 2nd ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 84-93.
[5] Mitchell, "The Shenandoah Valley Frontier," 463-463.
[6] Lieutenant Governor Alexander Spotswood to Lords Commissioners of Trade on January 27, 1714 *Letters of Alexander Spotswood,* 92-93.

plantation owners. The reality was, although small counties could trigger resistance to Tidewater oriented legislation, it was an unlikely outcome since the gentry had firm control over the Council and House of Burgesses. Regardless of this reality, inhabitants of the Blue Ridge would not be able to achieve the smaller counties they desired until a powerful landowner demonstrated interest in the region, which would not occur until the Beverleys came into the Shenandoah Valley in 1736.[7]

Despite the isolation of the Blue Ridge, settlers continued to migrate. Settlers formed small communities in order to survive in the frontier. Communities were often formed by a small group of families that were related to one another and had traveled to Virginia together. This fulfilled the requirement under Governor Gooch, Spotwood's successor as governor, which stipulated that land grants and patents be settled by families.[8] Gooch hoped this would encourage a higher population rate in the backcountry. These communities contained small farms that were placed close to one another, which allowed the settlers to aid one another on their properties. This was in contrast to the plantations on the Tidewater that encouraged isolation from the owner's neighbors. Virginian plantations were self-sustaining and centered on the success of the individual plantation, rather than community driven success seen in the Blue Ridge.[9]

Another benefit of these community oriented settlements was that they enabled the inhabitants to mediate civil disputes, albeit on a small scale, so that they would not have to make the long journey to an actual county court. With the centers for politics, justice, and trade far east in Germanna, communities used churches and community houses as places to solve some

---

[7] Aull, *Beverley Manor,* 1-5.
[8] Mitchell, "The Shenandoah Valley Frontier," 466-467.
Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia*, 427-429, 469.
[9] Farmer, *Absence of Towns,* 49-55.

civil disputes.[10] Community dependency produced different cultural development than the Tidewater's independent plantation system.

Ethnicity was another major component in the formation of these communities, and their distinction from the Tidewater region. Most of the families that settled the area were Scots-Irish or German, and had ventured into the area from the dangerous frontiers of Pennsylvania. Along those frontiers, attacks by Indians were more frequent and violent than in the Blue Ridge.[11] Some had moved into the Blue Ridge as part of a migration from New York, where immigrants, specifically German, sought affordable land outside of the Northeast, where their success had been limited.[12] Since most immigrated into the Virginia backcountry from the Pennsylvanian frontier, they were fairly easily persuaded into settling the Blue Ridge. Virginia could provide lower rent and better opportunity, which included the ease with which one could be involved in government. For potential settlers, Virginia was the land of economic success, driven by a thriving tobacco industry and self-sufficient government. For the Assembly and gentry of Virginia, these settlers possessed experience in the development of backcountry, which would be useful for settlements as far west as the Blue Ridge. As settlement builders, the Scots-Irish were useful to the gentry; however they were seen as too diverse to be trusted with local government.[13]

Although the majority of these communities were a network of families that had traveled to the Blue Ridge from the frontier of Pennsylvania, they were not necessarily composed of one single ethnicity. For example the Opequon settlement in the Shenandoah Valley consisted of

---

[10] Hofstra, *The Planting of New Virginia,* 94-115.
[11] John B Frantz, "The Religious Development of the Early German Settlers In 'Greater Pennsylvania': The Shenandoah Valley of Virginia," *Pennsylvania History* 68 no. 1 (Winter 2001): 71-73.
[12] Pillip Otternness, *Becoming German, the 1709 Palatine Migration to New York. (*Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004), 137-139.
[13] Hofstra, Planting of New Virginia, 144.

several families from different ethnic and religious backgrounds.[14] Diverse settlers, primarily considered "foreigners" to most English colonists, found the promise of a future in the Blue Ridge. Due to the nature of the environment, this future could not be attained individually; rather, the future had to be pursued as a community.

As settlements began to appear in the western part of the Blue Ridge, necessity required the settlers to advocate for local government, and petitions to create smaller counties with convenient access to county courts appeared almost immediately.[15] The Assembly was convinced of the need to expand the frontier, as seen in the creation of Spotsylvania, but their reaction to these petitions was much more prudent, due in large to the cultural differences between the settlers and gentry. Some of this may have come from a general distrust of Scots-Irish. Distrust in this form arose from problems between the Scotch-Irish in the Ulster land back before they ever began immigration into the American colonies.[16] This would have been impressed onto the subconscious of the gentry as members of the British Empire. This may have minimally affected the relationship between the gentry and the Scots-Irish; however, differences in religion and economics, coupled with the isolation of the region were more significant contributions to this distrust.

Religious belief was a part of gentry's culture, and there was a fear that differences in the Blue Ridge could lead to protest of the values of the Anglican society. Unlike German settlers, who were known to have a diverse range of religious denominations, the Scots-Irish were primarily Presbyterians.[17] Along the Blue Ridge Scots-Irish assembled Presbyterian

---

[14] Warren Hofstra, "Land Ethnicity, and Community at the Opequon Settlement, Virginia, 1730-1800," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 98 no. 3 (Jul., 1990): 423-428.
[15] Hening, *Statutes at Large*, 118.
[16] David Miller, "Searching for a New World, The Background and Baggage of Scots-Irish Immigrants," *Ulster to America*, ed. Warren Hofstra (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997): 1-24
[17] John Leland, *The Virginia Chronicle* 1789. American Historical Newspapers.

congregations, which the gentry feared would hinder the integration of their values into the west. Governor Gooch saw the potential for problems associated with religion in the region and responded with an encouragement of religious freedom along the frontier.[18] As long as members of these other religious groups did not openly reject the Anglican foundation of Virginia, they were free to participate in their own congregations. These settlers would still be required to take an oath of allegiance to the Church of England before they would be allowed to participate in any local politics, but they could still retain a sense of their cultural identity.[19] His message enticed many Scots-Irish who continued to settle the Blue Ridge for the next three decades.

Since they were so far from trade centers, they created a local economy that allowed members a certain level of success that would be unachievable on their own.[20] Small farms and mills dominated the economic landscape; however, this means of local success did not translate into commercial success. These communities produced goods that were consumed locally, so wealth was recycled within the community. Growth was stifled under this model, since the region was disconnected from the growth of eastern Virginia. Even after wealthy gentry became involved in the Blue Ridge, settlers failed to experience the wealth distribution of southern backcountry economies. These economies were successful because they had Virginian and emigrant settlers. The number of Virginian settlers extended the culture of the Tidewater into the backcountry without the direct use of elite gentry. Settlers in the Blue Ridge did not have these advantages, so they had no connection with the economy of the Tidewater. Economic disconnect was not solved when wealthy families became directly involved in the region; instead, a disparity

[18] Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia*, 185-186.
[19] Henning, *Statutes at Large*, 71.
[20] Christopher E Hendricks, *The Backcountry Towns of Colonial Virginia*, (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2006), 20-35.

in wealth distribution between the non-English settlers and the Virginians occurred.[21] In their development of local based economy, the settlers of the Blue Ridge demonstrated disconnect with the rest of the colony, which gave credence to the argument that they could not be trusted with Virginian government.

Tidewater Virginia was steeped in tobacco, slaves, and land. Tobacco dominated legislation, and was the largest export of the colony. Society was built around this staple, whether it was the way the elite was structured, the way debt was viewed, or the way land was associated with family.[22] Plantations served as the focal point of power and culture in eastern Virginia, and their absence in the Blue Ridge forced the inhabitants to structure their society around mills, small farms, and churches.[23] For these men, it was absurd to think about settlers in the Blue Ridge possessing the ability to use county government without a proper gentry influence. These settlers did not own slaves; most of them had bought smaller tracts of land that they chose to work on themselves because they were too poor to be slaveholders. Blue Ridge crops were primarily corn or wheat, and since they did not have large export crops they did not build their society around the idea of any trade outside of the Americas. These settlers relied on mills to process their crops so that they could make profits.[24] The settlements were much more community oriented because they had to work together to make profits for all parties. This included those who transported, those who supplied to the farmers and those who actually tilled the land. Since so much of the economy in the Tidewater was tied to these areas, there was a fear that other interests, like those found in the Blue Ridge, would interfere with the gentry's hold on beneficial legislation. Just as geography, ethnicity, and religion in the Blue Ridge

---

[21] Farmer, *In the Absence of Towns,* 104-107.
[22] Breen, *Tobacco Culture*, -135, 175-183.
[23] Farmer, *In the Absence of Towns,* 77-79
[24] Hendricks, *The Backcountry Towns of Colonial Virginia*, (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2006). Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia,* 292-293.

created dissonance between the settlers and the gentry, economics prohibited the inhabitants from the experience of Virginian government as well.

Governor Spotswood used the fear of French and Indian encroachment, as well as a recent conflict on the Carolina frontier, as the basis of his policy of westward expansion. While the establishment of settlements did protect the English settlements in the Piedmont, it did not eliminate the violence along the frontier. Discontentment with the colony's inability to defend the settlements would fill the fifteen years between the creation of Spotsylvania county and Orange County. Violence in the Blue Ridge occurred as settlers built communities along the old Indian roads, and relations between the Catawba and Iroquois grew tense. Petitions that circulated after the creation of Spotsylvania, which requested protection, aid, and treaties, demonstrated the threats settlers faced as they created communities across the Blue Ridge.[25] Spotsylvania created a new set of problems for the Assembly, as they had to decide how to best protect the English colonists and continue to encourage settlement in a dangerous region.

As settlers began to enter into the Blue Ridge, they occupied abandoned Indian Territory that was situated on old roads that connected tribes from the north to the south. After settlement began in 1720, these roads came back into use as Indian alliances were created between the Catawba and their neighbors. For settlers, these same roads provided connection to other communities and a way to connect the valley with the piedmont. As the roads became used more frequently, conflict also became more frequent. Theft and property damage were the primary reports against the Indians in the Blue Ridge, although instances of violence were not unheard

[25] *Legislative Journals*, 83, 96.
Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia*, 101-108.

of.[26] The buffer zone the Virginia government had orchestrated to act as a shield against Indian attacks did not solve conflict within the region; rather, it added another layer to an already complicated problem.

There were a couple of groups who perpetrated the conflict in the Blue Ridge, one of which was the Catawba. The Catawba lived in the Valley of the Blue Ridge decades before settlers began their migration into the region, and were a large presence in the both the Blue Ridge and the Carolinas.[27] The Saponi, a former faction of the Catawba, were encouraged by Governor Spotswood to move towards Fort Christanna since they were frequent traders with the British.[28] It was this special relationship that developed between the colony and the Saponi that further complicated Indian relations on the frontier. Colonial interests dictated that the Saponi had to have some form of protection to ensure the continuation of positive trade relations. This was a part of Spotswood's plan to consolidate and control trade along the frontier. In order to control the frontier, Virginia had to protect the settlements and ally Indian groups. Robert Carter wrote of the difficulty to "protect the Tributary Indians" when he described the violence between the Catawba and Saponi during the winter of 1727.[29] Blue Ridge settlers experienced the frustration of the dual attention of Virginia, which had used the settlers as a buffer against potential conflict but failed to protect the settlers they had lured into the area.

It was the Catawba who most frequently used the road to travel between their country to the south and the Tuscarora land to the north. As another powerful group in the region, the Tuscarora were once allies of the Catawba; although the relationship was complicated after the

---

[26] Hofstra, *The Planting of New Virginia*, 17, 44-49, 101-105.
[27] James H Merrell, "The Indians New World: The Catawba Experience" *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 41 no. 4 (Oct., 1984): 542-547
[28] Ibid., 544, 547-548.
[29] *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, 300.

Tuscarora became allies with the Iroquois.[30] This alliance created conflict between the Tuscarora and Catawba, who resisted joining the Iroquois. The Tuscarora were welcomed into the Iroquois League before the establishment of Spotsylvania, but the Catawba resisted the Iroquois for decades.[31] Conflict that resulted from the Catawba-Tuscarora spilled into the Blue Ridge.

While the Catawba, Saponi, and Tuscarora groups experienced conflict with one another, they also began to experience conflict with the settlers who moved west into territory that they felt was under their control. In fact, Indians complained of settlement in their land to the Virginian government. In a petition dated September 9, 1723, a complaint against the settlers in the Virginia backcountry was issued. It stated,

> To the most honorable Governor of Virginia, a petition from the Meherrin Indians to you most honorable highness and Excellency, we poor Indians have need to complain to your most honorable highness. For our land is all taken from us and the English do say that they will come and take our corn from us that we have made in our corn fields, and we cannot live at rest, except [if] your most honorable highness do order something to the contrary…[32]

Even though this petition was from the southern Virginia backcountry, it illuminates the general feelings of mistrust between the settlers and the Indians. As a result of these tensions violence, theft, and property damage became a part of the danger for the settlers in the Blue Ridge.

Governor Spotswood used the image of Indian violence that had occurred on the frontiers

---

[30] Gregory Evans Dowd, *War Under Heaven: Pontiac,the Indian Nations, and the British Empire,* 2001. (Reprint, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004), 37-38.
Merrell, "The Catawba Experience" 542-528.
[31] Dowd, *War Under Heaven* 37-38.
Merrell, "The Catawba Experience" 537-556.
Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia*, 58-62.
[32] *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, 291.

of the Carolinas in the Yamasee and Tuscarora attacks on colonists as a way to encourage land settlement west. As a result, Governor Gooch had to enact carefully planned land policies to protect Virginia's growing land from hostility as the movement west put settlers and Indians in direct paths along Indian roads. Settlers were deemed to be too foreign for county government, which could provide protection, and possibly representation, in Indian policy, but they were also considered a problem to Indian groups that lived in the region.

In an effort to control some of the problems in the area, Spotswood negotiated the Treaty of Albany, which required a passport be issued for any Indian to travel along the roads of the Blue Ridge; however this system was hard to enforce with such ineffective county court systems in the frontier.[33] Both Governor Spotswood and his successor Governor Gooch attempted various treaties with the Indians of the Blue Ridge, but none of these were effective without counties that were able to enforce them. Inhabitants of the Blue Ridge petitioned for closer county courts that would allow them to uphold peace within their communities. Even though the Indian groups were not a part of the British Empire, they could still be held accountable in the county court system. A letter to Colonel Bassett in 1720 demonstrates the Indians were brought to the Justice of the Peace after a crime had been committed.[34] If Spotsylvania was allowed to split into a smaller counties, the settlers would be able to use their Justices of the Peace to prosecute Indians and uphold some order within their boundaries, but the Virginia government refused to relent in their distrust of the inhabitants in the region.

Another reason Blue Ridge settlers petitioned for local counties was so they could have a

[33] Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia*, 65-67.
[34] *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, 285.

local militia that might serve as protection against the tensions on the frontier. Petitions for local militia, and complaints about the lack of protection, were issued on behalf of the inhabitants of the frontier.[35] These petitions complained of the lack of protection from Indian conflict. One complaint, issued in 1727, even listed a grievance against Governor Spotswood as misappropriating funds and ammunition to the county.[36] Still, the perceived risk of non-English control over local government was too great to allow the creation of smaller counties. As a result, settlers recognized that being isolated from the rest of the colony meant they had to act for themselves in defense against western hostility.

In fact, this need for self-preservation was the reason the backcountry pushed for an active militia in the 1720s, and the reason they would be hesitant to use the militia in the Seven Years' War decades later.[37] When these residents demanded a militia, it was to protect their communities from direct attack. Later, when Virginia wanted to call on these very militia men to aid in the war, they were hesitant to provide help. This is another symptom of disconnect between the Blue Ridge and the rest of Virginia, created by the Assembly's refusal to create counties in the Blue Ridge. Albert H Tilson cites the settlers' unwillingness to serve in militias during the Seven Years' War as an example of settlers in the Blue Ridge possessing no interest in government.[38] While this may appear to be the case, it fails to account for the expressed desire by the settlers to have local government. Perhaps this unwillingness to aid Virginia came from the sense of self-preservation that had allowed the settlers to survive with limited colonial help. It is clear that the settlers desired to have local government. They desired to use the

---

[35] *Calendar of Virginia Papers,* 235, 285, 286
Legislative Journals, 118.
[36]Calendar of Papers, 294-295.
[37] James Titus, *The Old Dominion at War: Society, Politics, and Warfare in Late Colonial Virginia,* (Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1991), 31-33.
[38] Albert H Tilson Jr., "The Militia and Popular Culture in the Upper Valley of Virginia, 1740-1775," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 94 no. 3 Virginians at War, 1607-1865 (Jul., 1986): 288.

county courts, raise a militia, and utilize the order provided through offices like the Justice of the Peace.

In response to the requests from the gentry and inhabitants of the Blue Ridge, a militia and rangers were granted for the region, but without a county court to actually enforce justice.[39] In order to achieve this enforcement, the Council would have to appoint members of the county as Justices of the Peace that could act as judges in the county court.[40] Without a local county court, however, Justices of the Peace would not be useful. With the county court in Germanna, the only way to administer enforcement of laws would be to capture an offender and bring them to the eastern edge of Spotsylvania. Spotswood, whose residence housed the first court, was able to assert gentry influence over civil matters.[41] For the Virginian elite this was still vital, especially since the violence on the Blue Ridge frontier was low in comparison to the Carolinas or Pennsylvania.[42] Unless the violence threatened the interests of the gentry, there was little motivation to allow the inhabitants access to county courts.

For fifteen years the government of Virginia denied the creation of smaller counties in the Blue Ridge.[43] Under Spotswood, settlements began to be built across the Blue Ridge. Most of the inhabitants of the settlements were different from the Virginian elite who controlled the Assembly. The threat of Indian violence against these settlements persuaded the government to grant limited protection to the settlers, but they stopped short of full access to county

---

[39] Ibid., 285-287.
Calendar of Virginia Papers, 189.
[40] Beverley, *The History of Virginia,* 208-209.
[41] Hening, *Statutes,* 54.
[42] Titus, *Old Dominion at War,* 5-10.
[43] *Calendar of Virginia Papers,*190. *Journals of the Council* 12, 25, 34, 35.
Journals of the Council, 59.

government. Virginians tried to encourage settlement into the Blue Ridge without allowing these settlers to interfere with the tobacco policy of the Tidewater elite. Virginians were afraid that Presbyterian settlers from Pennsylvania would not be able to represent the interests of plantation Virginia. Gentry could only trust gentry to assert Tidewater values into the new frontier. A purchase of land in 1736 by William Beverley would begin a process of gentry placement that would ensure that the potential representatives for any future county would be of the Tidewater mindset.

Despite the hesitancy of the Assembly to provide government to the settlers, the region did grow. This growth was promising to land owners who were interested in possible speculation in the Blue Ridge, but the government was concerned because the growth was still sluggish. Land became available for purchase not only through grants and private sales, but through purchases directly from the government.[44] This was intended to encourage migration into Virginia. Land prices were only one factor into the decision to settle the Blue Ridge, another was for the freedom associated with Virginia. Unfortunately, inhabitants were not able to attain this as quickly as they had hoped. Problems would persist for the inhabitants of the Blue Ridge who had been lured to the region by cheap land, then left to depend on each other for survival.

Neither the Assembly nor the Governor ever forgot about the Blue Ridge; rather, the Blue Ridge was a part of a careful plan to shape the western frontier into a backcountry completely controlled by the government. When Gooch expressed a desire for religious freedom, he was attempting to encourage the kind of diversity that was found in the southern backcountry. Similarly, when he and the Assembly passed an act to naturalize the inhabitants as citizens of Virginia, they hoped to slowly encourage the westward movement of others into the area. This

[44] Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia*, 91-92.

would allow the creation of smaller counties under the supervision of Virginians from the east. Virginia government saw the potential of the Shenandoah Valley and wanted to maintain control of a vast amount of newly settled land; so they stalled. They prohibited small counties, encouraged growth, and then placed one of their own as a controller of a new county.

Chapter 3

Dispute in the Northern Neck

On September 20th 1734, after years of petitions, letters, and conflict, Spotsylvania was split to create the county of Orange.[1] Conflict did not evaporate after the creation of Orange; rather, it increased through a battle within the Northern Neck of the Blue Ridge. This conflict was not based on frontier violence or discontentment among the settlers; this was a conflict that exemplified the new importance of the Blue Ridge: a conflict between the colony of Virginia and Lord Fairfax. The Fairfax-Virginia dispute is central to the understanding of county creation in the Blue Ridge. Through this conflict and legal case, both the creation of Orange County and the establishment of Augusta County were used to promote the special interest of Virginian gentry. Legal battles over this region would continue for decades; however, the conflict between Virginia and Fairfax was best demonstrated within expansion and county creation between 1734 and 1738.

Lord Thomas Fairfax the Sixth inherited the Northern Neck grant in 1710. He remained uninterested in this inheritance until 1730; instead, he preferred to pursue various careers in public policy.[2] Since Fairfax preferred to pursue professional success in London, his grant was monitored by Robert Carter, which allowed him to have an advocate in Virginia without actually moving there himself. After Carter died in 1730, the Northern Neck became exposed to colonial

[1] *Legislative Journals*, 232.
[2] Fairfax Harrison, "The Proprietors of the Northern Neck. Chapters of Culpeper Genealogy," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography.* 34 no 1. (Jan., 1926): 36.

intrusion.[3] This event, coupled with a lack of success in England, caused Fairfax to shift his focus towards the colony where he found his future linked to the success of his grant. Once again Virginians saw an outsider take interest in their backcountry. Much like Spotswood, Fairfax found a passion for the development of the backcountry and in 1745 he moved onto his land where he found success as a land owner.[4]

Lord Fairfax found himself at odds with Virginia over a large tract of land referred to as the Northern Neck. According to Fairfax, this land contained most of the Blue Ridge, as seen in Figure 2. Since this area included Swift Run Gap, one of the only passages west, whoever controlled it would have significant influence in the region. As one of the few passages over the mountains, this passage allowed settlers access to colonial trade, which made it important to the maintenance of economic stability in the region. It was also important as land speculation began to rise in western Virginia.[5] Both Governor Spotswood and Gooch attempted to introduce settlements close to the Northern Neck boundaries as an assertion of colonial interest in the area.

Lord Fairfax acquired the Northern Neck through an inheritance from his grandfather Lord Culpeper, who was granted the land by King Charles II.[6] This grant was given to a group of supporters of the King after he fled England. Lord Culpeper purchased the rights to the full grant, after serving as Governor in the colony, which was controversial in Virginia. Robert Beverley accused Lord Culpeper of manipulating the colonists at a time when the colony was not in active pursuit of expansion.[7] In his accusation Beverley claimed that Culpeper created the dysfunction between the Council and House of Burgesses so that he could gain full control of the

---

[3] Ibid.,
[4] Stanley Phillips Smith, "The Northern Neck's Role in American Legal History." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 77, no. 3 (July, 1969): 277-290.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Stanley Phillips Smith, "The Northern Neck's Role in American Legal History" *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 77 no. 3 (Jul., 1969): 277-278.
[7] Beverley, *History of Virginia,* 74-76.

patents to the Northern Neck. With a divided government, Culpeper could extend

Figure 2: A survey of the northern neck of Virginia, being the lands belonging to the Rt. Honourable Thomas Lord Fairfax Baron Cameron, Library of Congress.

the patent to include land Virginia had already began to settle. Had the government not been divided, Beverley argued, they would have been able to see the potential constraint Culpeper's land grab would put on future expansion. In reality the colony was not interested in the backcountry at the time Culpeper acquired full access to the Northern Neck grant. Beverley's account blamed Culpeper for the hostility Spotswood encountered in 1720 when he unveiled his land policy to the Assembly, although the notion that Culpeper possessed sole responsibility for the tension seems unlikely. Beverley's account was written in 1722, after he had completed his

exploration of the Blue Ridge with Governor Spotswood. An early ally of Spotswood and his land policy, Beverley understood the importance of the Northern Neck to settling the Blue Ridge. While Beverley's account was biased towards Spotswood, his sentiments were echoed throughout the legal and legislative battles between Virginia and Fairfax.

Culpeper and Fairfax found themselves in the midst of a battle to define the Northern Neck. According to Fairfax the land in this grant totaled over five million acres.[8] If true, this made Fairfax the holder of a vast property in the Blue Ridge that included land previously granted to settlers from the Assembly. Virginia created settlements in this disputed region when they created Spotsylvania County. Before the settlement of the Blue Ridge, the Northern Neck had been the fastest growing region since the late 1600s.[9] In fact, they had even granted Robert Carter, Lord Fairfax's executive of the grant, land in the area.[10]

The original grant as written in 1649 described the Northern Neck boundaries as "bounded by and within the head of the rivers Tappahannock, alias Rappahannock, and Quiriough, or Potomack rivers, the courses of the said rivers as they are commonly called and known by the inhabitants, and descriptions of those parts, and Chesapayock Bay, together with the rivers themselves, and all the islands within the banks of those rivers."[11] As stated in this description, parts of the Blue Ridge and the Shenandoah Valley were under ownership dispute. If Lord Fairfax's interpretation was correct then he held much of the northern ridge and valley; however, if Virginia's interpretation was correct, the area could continue to be settled in carefully planned steps that would ensure the success of western expansion.

---

[8] "The Right Honourable Thomas Lord Fairfax, Petitioner, The Governor and Council of Virginia, in Right of the Crown, Defendants. The Case on Behalf of the Crown." Virginia. Governor and Council. (London: 1745) Early Century Collections Online Database. 3.
[9] Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom*, 244.
[10] "The Right Honourable Thomas Lord Fairfax, Petitioner," 3-4.
Smith, "The Northern Neck's Role," 277.
[11] "The Right Honourable Thomas Lord Fairfax, Petitioner," 2.

A revision of the grant in 1679 made two important changes to the original.[12] First, the boundary was changed from the heads of the Rappahannock and Potomac rivers to the first heads or springs of the rivers. This alteration was used by Lord Fairfax as a way to extend his grant to the furthest possible boundaries. Second, a provision that required the land to be settled within twenty years was dropped, which allowed Lord Fairfax to claim land under the grant in the eighteenth century after years of non-use. It was this second change that the colonists took such offense to because Fairfax allowed his land to go without any development or interest until 1728, after Virginia had already began to implement their policy for expansion into the region.[13]

In September of 1736, the House of Burgesses addressed "A Bill Entitled An Act for Confirming and better Securing the Titles to Lands in the Northern Neck held under the Right Honourable Thomas Lord Fairfax" where they decided to dispatch a team of surveyors to define the boundaries of Fairfax's grant.[14] As this investigation into the bounds of the Fairfax grant occurred, Orange County was created.[15] These two counties were formed from the two distinct Parishes, St. George and St. Mark, which had been established in 1730.[16] After more than a decade of petitions, the inhabitants of the Blue Ridge were granted access to smaller counties. This was not because the Assembly recognized the importance of accessible county government to the settlement's development; rather, it was because ambiguous backcountry boundaries threatened the interests of colonial expansion. In fact, at its creation the boundaries of Orange

[12] Smith, "The Northern Neck's Role,"279-280.
[13] Hofstra, *The Planting of New Virginia*, 86-87.
[14] Henning, *Statutes at Large*, 440.
[15] Hening's *Statutes at Large*. 440.
[16] *Journal of the House of Burgesses, 1730.* (Williamsburg, VA: William Parks, 1730), 460. Early Eighteenth-Century Collections Online Database.

County were placed in the midst of disputed territory, asserting a claim made by Virginia that the Northern Neck had been historically defined as a smaller area than Fairfax now claimed.[17] This was an important component to the legal case brought to the Virginia Supreme Court and later the Privy Council.

Of course the image of Lord Fairfax as a successful member of colonial society was not an image that suited the goals of Virginia. For the gentry that were in the process of speculation in the area, Fairfax was an outsider. He could not be trusted to understand the interests of the gentry, in the same way Spotswood and the settlers themselves would not. What is more, through the assertion of his claims in the Northern Neck, Fairfax threatened the economic future of many planters who hoped to send their sons to the region.[18] The massive tract of land Fairfax claimed was enough to severely reduce the acres available for speculation.

Virginia understood that the Blue Ridge was important as it ensured a stable western expansion, it held important passages to trade and defense, and it provided a new source of revenue for a tobacco dependent colony. If Fairfax was allowed to execute his version of the grant, the benefits from the region for Virginia could be affected. According to Lord Fairfax, land in his grant totaled over 5,200,000 acres. His primary argument for this number came from the amendment to the grant in 1688 that declared the first springs, or heads of the Rappahannock and Potomac Rivers to be the borders of the land.[19] Virginians claimed that this could not be an accurate representation of the grant because, at the grant's conception, most of the Northern Neck lay undiscovered. According to the complaint filed in London, Virginia used the inhabitants in the region as evidence of the recent discovery of the region.[20] These inhabitants

[17] Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia*, 115-116.
[18] Holton, *Forced Founders*, 5-37.
[19] "The Right Honourable Thomas Lord Fairfax, Petitioner," 1, 3.
[20] Ibid., 1-4.

could confirm that people had not been present in the region at the time the grant was given, since they were some of the original settlements in the Northern Neck. This was used as evidence of the colony's right to the land to the Privy Council. "The same had greatly alarmed all the inhabitants of the Forks—that they cannot find, by any evidence that the fork of Rappahannock River had been at all discovered at the time of Lord Culpeper's Grant… in 1707 there were not inhabitants, on either side of the rivers."[21] Fairfax contradicted this point. He argued that since the boundaries of the rivers were explicit in the grant any future discoveries within the region were implied. As Virginians like Governor Spotswood discovered more of the territory to the west, they added land to Fairfax's grant. For Virginia, which had invested money and time in development of the land, this was an unacceptable outcome. With this in mind, Virginia encouraged land settlement along the region in dispute so that they had even more claim to the area.

Potential for conflict between Fairfax and the colony was seen as far back as 1728, when Robert Carter, on behalf of Fairfax, petitioned the government to stop grants for settlement in the region because they would be disputed.[22] As a member of the Virginian gentry, Carter heard the plans to develop the Blue Ridge and expand west, which provided him with insight into the worth of Fairfax's land. Carter warned the Assembly that some settlements in the Blue Ridge were in the Fairfax grant, but his concern was formally dismissed.[23] Virginia had its own plans for the Blue Ridge.

When the case was brought before the Privy Council in 1740 Virginia used Carter as an example of how the boundaries of the Northern Neck were not as extensive as Fairfax claimed.[24]

---

[21] Ibid., 2.
[22] *Calendar of Papers of Virginia,* 301.
[23] Ibid.
[24] "The Right Honourable Thomas Lord Fairfax, Petitioner," 1,3

Since Robert Carter had presented himself such a loyal agent to the Fairfax grant, he would have made it a point to protect the lines that were understood to border the property. Through his acceptance of land in an area later claimed as part of Fairfax's Northern Neck, Carter unknowingly provided a proof to Virginia's claim that the Northern Neck as understood at the time of grant was different than the Northern Neck disputed in 1728.[25] If the colonists could prove that knowledge of the property was different at the time of the grant, they could also prove that their aggressive attempts at land settlement were justified. While there may have not been as many counties as would be necessary to prove a steady development of the region, the settlements themselves became vital to the case.

Settlements within Fairfax's version of the Northern Neck presented their own unique set of issues. Questions arose over land ownership and civil order in the backcountry. These questions would be resolved through the Assembly, courts, and the Privy Council. As the Virginia government attempted to create and manage settlements in the Blue Ridge, Fairfax sought to profit from his land; somewhere in between these two sides the inhabitants were left to figure out who had ultimate control over their future.

Jost Hite is perhaps the best known of the settlers caught in the middle of the grant dispute.[26] As a German immigrant from the Pennsylvania frontier, he and his family had formed a settlement in Opequon during the early 1730's. Hite was representative of most settlers in the Blue Ridge who were lured by Gooch's policy, which allowed settlers to get land directly from

---

[25] Ibid.
[26] Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia*, 34-35.
Smith, "The Northern Neck's Role," 280-282.
Philip Otterness, *Becoming German, the 1709 Palatine Migration to New York.* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004), 138-139.

the government if settled by families.[27] Hite unknowingly invested in property directly contested by Fairfax. The Opequon settlement he called home was established on the frontline of the boundary dispute.

Hite, along with other settlers, were granted land in the Shenandoah Valley, which was not, in fact, a part of Spotsylvania County. At its creation in 1720, the Spotsylvania county line ended at the Rappahannock River; however, the Virginia government actively pursued settlement further west.[28] Since there was no county that governed the area Virginia would have a hard time with their claim of ownership of the land. Settlement became a viable way to demonstrate Virginia's continued presence, and therefore rights to ownership, in the disputed land.[29] Colonial sponsored settlement continued despite the protest from Fairfax. In fact, these settlements' successes would prove to be important to county creation and the actual case against Lord Fairfax.[30] The very year Hite first received notice that his land title was in dispute, Orange County was created.[31] This cannot be looked at as merely a coincidence; rather it must be acknowledged as a calculated decision to legitimize Virginian claims in the Blue Ridge by the Assembly. It was the threat of losing the Blue Ridge that prompted the Assembly to pass an act to create Orange County. So, this new county would be extended to include the settlements past the Rappahannock, in the hope that through Orange's establishment future western expansion would be protected.

---

[27] Warren Hofstra, "The Virginia Backcountry in the Eighteenth Century: The Question of Origins and the Issue of Outcomes." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 101, no. 4 (October, 1993): 485-508.
Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia,* 97-115.
Mitchell, "Shenandoah Valley Frontier," 486-487.
[28] Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia,* 113-116.
[29] Ibid.
[30] Hofstra, "Land, Ethnicity, and Community at Opequon," 427-428.
[31] Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia*, 115.
[31]Smith, "The Northern Neck's Role," 281.

Ambiguous boundaries brought with them ambiguous authority. Questions on legal authority within settlements in the disputed land arose as boundaries were debated. Governor Gooch believed his royal authority extended into potential propriety under a vague order from England that issued required governors to watch proprietors who might attempt to take land from the crown under the guise of grants.[32] Gooch used his interpretation of the instructions to ignore the proprietorship and continue to grant land in Fairfax's claims. He also used this same logic to execute legal authority into the region. In a submission to the council, the opinion of the Attorney General confirmed Gooch's thought, stating that the governor did have legal authority in the region.[33] While this decision specifically stated that he held the right to pardon felonies of those in the area, it was important because it allowed the Governor to claim legal authority in land that could be considered Fairfax's. Through this interpretation the settlers in the Blue Ridge, even those in disputed territory, were under the authority of the Governor. This would undermine Fairfax's own authority in the region.

Government, which included the institutions of the county, provided an extension of the legal authority Gooch believed should be extended into the disputed areas of the Blue Ridge. Typically county courts led by appointed Justices of the Peace that were thought to be loyal to colonial interests, would be utilized in settlements to assert this authority. Gentry were still leery of the settlers in the Blue Ridge; however the potential interest of the Beverley family in the region provided a sense of security. With a family like the Beverleys in the region, some form of local government could be monitored, which would provide the extension of Gooch's authority

[32] Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia*, 86-87.
[33] *Calendar of Papers of Virginia*, 297.

into areas involved in the Fairfax dispute.

With this extension of Virginia in mind, Jost Hite became a Justice of the Peace in 1734, along with the Beverleys' surveyor, Robert Brooke.[34] Hite and Brooke could be trusted to provide stability in new county government because they had interests in its success. For Hite this interest was intensely personal; failure could result in a loss of property. For Robert Brooke, surveyor of the Blue Ridge, the interest was primarily based on his personal revenue. Both men needed the government to be legitimate and successful so their participation in expansion could be considered valued. This made them more trustworthy than a settler who was less dependent on colonial success in the county. Another man was chosen to become a Justice of the Peace with Hite and Brooke: Benjamin Borden.[35] Borden was a Virginian who received a grant south of William Beverley's in the Blue Ridge. His active presence in the region allowed the Assembly to feel more comfortable with the idea of English justice being administered in the Blue Ridge. Borden was largely unsuccessful in his attempts to settle his grant, but his presence was vital to the extension of government into the Blue Ridge.[36]

In 1736, Fairfax won his battle in London and was granted most of the Northern Neck.[37] Governor Gooch was unsuccessful in his attempts to win the Northern Neck through active settlement. He was unable to demonstrate Fairfax's lack of control over the region; however, this Fairfax victory did not prevent further controversy. Hite went on to sue Fairfax for the title to his property and various legal wrangling lasted until the Revolution.[38] Many settlers found themselves in difficult circumstances under the favorable Fairfax ruling. A condition of the

---

[34] Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia*, 160-162.
[35] Ibid., 161.
[36] Ibid., 113-114.
[37] Virginia Historical Society, "Documents of the Boundaries of the Northern Neck" *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography,* 28 no. 4 (Oct., 1920): 298.
[38] Smith, "The Northern Neck's Role," 280.
[38] Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia*, 33-36,161.

verdict was that Fairfax would honor the property of the settlers who had land titles. Settlers who had received actual grants for their settlements would be protected under the new proprietorship; however, most settlers did not have actual titles or grants to their land. Instead, most settlers in the Blue Ridge attained land through a process where land was settled first and the title could be granted.[39] This process made the acquisition of land grants easier for settlers who migrated from Pennsylvania, but made protection under Fairfax ruling significantly more difficult.

Soon after his victory, Fairfax began the process of re-surveying the land of the settlements under his proprietorship. As maps were redrawn, some settlers found themselves with smaller or altered property.[40] Settlements were forced to readjust to the idea that their communities were now altered. There is evidence that the settlers expressed fear of this outcome as early as 1730. A petition read to the House of Burgesses in May 1730 stated that they were, "praying to be relieved against demand of the lessee of the proprietor of the Northern Neck claiming the said land as within the bounds of the proprietors grant."[41]

For the inhabitants of the Blue Ridge that remained a part of Virginia, the establishment of county courts became even more important. Land disputes, and titles could be better processed in these courts. Although the creation of Orange County brought with it closer county courts, the accessibility was still difficult, especially for those on the western side of the mountain. For Virginia, county creation also became important. When William Beverley received his grant in the Blue Ridge, a Virginian arrived into a troubled region. His large grant ensured him control over the region. This was important after the loss of the Northern Neck. Virginian interests in the Blue Ridge were at stake, which in turn threatened any further

[39] Smith, "The Northern Neck's Role," 280-281.
[40] Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia*,145-146.
[41] *Calendar of Papers of Virginia*, 166.

expansion. A discussion about full integration of the region into Virginian politics could finally occur, not because the inhabitants' petitions were finally heard; rather, because Virginia could ensure its own success.

Fairfax's victory cost the colony revenue from taxes, rents, and sales. More importantly this victory presented the gentry with an urgent need to develop the Blue Ridge. With Fairfax as an active presence on the frontier, the colony would have to implement a plan to ensure their ability to be successful in expansion well into the future. The placement of Jost Hite and the grant to Beverley and Borden were a part of that plan. If settlements were developed on the frontier, they could combat the threat Fairfax posed to the colony.

Fear of the loss of potential western expansion convinced the Assembly of the need to develop the settlements in the Blue Ridge. One part of this development was the creation of counties that would enable the inhabitants to become active in local government. Gentry were still concerned over the potential problems associated with non-English participation in county government, but the external factors that threatened their personal potential in the region could not be ignored.

Chapter 4

A Gentleman and A Plan

William Beverley was issued a grant of 118,491 acres in the Blue Ridge from the Virginia Assembly in 1736. This grant officially placed a member of the gentry in the region, an action that would enable the Tidewater to assert its influence in any new counties that might be carved out of the region. Inhabitants had petitioned for better access to county courts since Spotsylvania was in its infancy; however, until the Beverleys entered the region, these inhabitants could not be trusted to act in solidarity with the Tidewater interests. After the establishment of the Beverley grant the Assembly initiated a plan to divide Orange County and create Augusta County.

Changes in the Assembly's attitudes on country creation in the Blue Ridge came about in1736. This was the result of the shift towards western migration that resulted in the need to develop the region. Gentry saw the Blue Ridge as Spotswood did when he first traversed Swift Run Gap, the key to a future in western expansion. As gentry families sought new land on which to establish their sons on, and as land speculation of land in the west became more lucrative, country creation became a viable means to extending Tidewater values into newly acquired territory. When Robert Beverley traveled with Spotswood to locate the possibilities on the frontier, he may not have envisioned the importance his family would have in that region; however the Beverleys' commitment to the establishment of their interest in the Blue Ridge allowed them to become the cornerstone for Augusta County.

William Beverley received the grant, on which he eventually built Beverley Manor, on September, 6 1736.[1] The land granted was on the western side of the Blue Ridge Mountains. Established during the time of the Fairfax conflict, the Beverly grant allowed Virginia to claim that gentry interests were in danger in the boundary dispute. More importantly, because the county now had boundaries that extended beyond the Valley, the settlers could be watched and swayed by a powerful Virginian family. Like the Beverleys many wealthy families began to migrate to the frontier, although the Beverleys held dominance in the Blue Ridge.

William Beverley was the son of Robert Beverley II. He was a member of the Governor's Council and a distinguished resident of Essex County.[2] The Beverley grant was the second largest grant, after Lord Fairfax's, in the Virginia backcountry.[3] The placement of this massive land grant countered the claim made by Fairfax in his battle with Virginia; however, the placement of a distinguished member of Virginia gentry also exposed the region to the accepted social norms of these elite. William Beverley's family had been wealthy members of Virginian society since his grandfather, Major Robert Beverley, established himself as a successful plantation owner in the 1600s. For William Beverley, an extension of land into the Blue Ridge was a way to further cement his family's success in Virginia. This land would eventually be occupied briefly by his son, Robert Beverley, and more permanently by his grandson Carter Beverley, as a continuation of the trend towards land purchase to sustain large gentry families.[4]

While the establishment of an influential family in the Blue Ridge was beneficial to

---

[1] Joseph. A. Waddell, *Annals of Augusta County, from 1726-1871*, 2nd edition (Digital Harvard College Library), 29.
[2] Aull, *History of Staunton and Beverley Manor,* (Bayside Books: Maryland, 1963), 8.
[3] Mitchell, "The Shenandoah Valley," 467.
[4] Breen, *Tobacco Culture*, 41-43.
William Beverley, "Will of William Beverley" *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 22, no. 3 (July, 1914): 297-301.

Virginia's legal battle with Lord Fairfax, William Beverley did not share the same animosity, as other Tidewater gentry, towards Virginia's adversary. In fact, William Beverley was quite fond of Colonel Fairfax, whom he referred to as a "very good friend," and maintained close contact with Lord Fairfax as well as with Robert Carter, Fairfax's executor.[5] Beverley was perhaps the perfect candidate for a grant in infant Orange County. He was able to exert the will of the elite and benefit from his friendship with Fairfax. In a letter to Fairfax composed in 1739 Beverley expressed his desire for an outcome favorable to Fairfax and his appreciation for "kind promises and assurances on behalf of [his] friends in the fork."[6] Fairfax had some disputed land in Augusta, and this letter may have been referring to assurances made to Beverley that his land would not be affected by the conflict.[7] Beverley was in a unique position to gain benefits from both sides of the Fairfax conflict.

Beverley's presence in Orange County allowed Tidewater social values to infiltrate backcountry society. This influence was possible even though Carter Beverley would not reside in Beverley Manor until the late eighteenth century, because of the close ties the Beverleys maintained with their agents, John Lewis and Robert Brooke.[8] These agents were immigrants but they demonstrated the desire to bring the success of the Tidewater culture to the Blue Ridge. Aside from tobacco, which had mixed results in the Blue Ridge region, slavery was one of the most important markers of gentry life. The community-centered small farms, which initially populated the area, were not conducive to the slave-holding lifestyle. Of course, it was not that

---

[5] Beverley to Bryan Fairfax, London, August 9, 1742, in "Some Letters of William Beverley," ed. Worthington Chauncey Ford, *The William and Mary Quarterly* 3 no. 4 (April, 1865): 230.
[6] Beverley to Lord Fairfax, London, May 18, 1739, in "Some Letters of William Beverley," 228.
[7] McCleskey, "Rich Land, Poor Land," 459-460.
[8] On Thomas Lewis and Brooks: Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia*, 21-22, 115.
McCleskey, "Rich Man Poor Man," 469-472.
On Beverley: Waddell, *Annals*, 89.

the inhabitants of the region were opposed to slaves; they were simply too poor to become owners. Without Beverley in the region the creation of Orange County and potential creation of Augusta, would have allowed settlers who did not place the same value on slaves as the rest of Virginia to send representatives to the Assembly. Beverley provided an assurance that the settlers in the region would still place value on the sense of status slavery brought to the gentry.

Beverley and his agents' presence could also ensure that these counties would not become safe havens for runaway slaves. This fear was expressed multiple times in the Assembly, even though settlement of the Blue Ridge was originally planned to be a preventative measurement to stop escaping slaves.[9] Beverley could influence the Justices of the Peace and members of the county court to act consistently with the slaveholder values of Tidewater. It would be less likely that slaves would feel comfortable in an attempted escape if they knew that there were Justices of the Peace and county governments in the backcountry that represented the views of the slave-owners of the Tidewater. A potential representative from the backcountry would be less likely to contradict the interests of the gentry in the Assembly if they had a powerful family in their region. If county government was to be established in a way that benefited the gentry, members of the community needed to experience some pressure to ensure their support of Tidewater life.

William Beverley's primary motive in obtaining a grant of backcountry land was speculation. He established John Lewis as the captain of Beverley Manor to ensure his interests in this new property.[10] Most of Lewis's job involved the introduction of settlers to Beverley's land. This was very important to county development in the backcountry. Governor Gooch had

[9] Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia,* 66-67.
[10] Ibid, 162.

attempted to encourage land settlement in the Blue Ridge throughout the 1730s, but Beverley represented private speculation in the region. Men like Jost Hite were able to find success in land ownership and even some local politics, but Beverley could use his own influence to encourage migration into the region. Beverley was one of the first gentry figures to speculate in the frontier west of the Blue Ridge Mountains. Most of the gentry class did not engage in the race for western speculation until the late 1740s.[11] Even though the Beverley grant was not a part of the speculation race of later Virginia, Beverley demonstrated the new wave of speculation that would eventually bring prosperity to other members of the gentry class.

One motivation Beverley had for this land speculation was to acquire land that his sons could inherit. William himself remained a resident of Blandfield in Essex County; it was one of his sons who built Beverley Manor. As active tobacco planters, the Beverleys had grown accustomed to the vast, isolated landscape of the plantation.[12] With less land available in the Tidewater, many families chose to acquire land in the frontier so their sons would be able to live on their own land and continue the plantation tradition. At the time of his death in 1756, William Beverley's will described landholdings in Augusta County, Essex County, Caroline County, King and Queen County, and Culpeper County.[13] The Blue Ridge was not suited for tobacco crops; however, the revenue that could be generated in patent sales and rent could still allow a Tidewater gentleman to enrich himself. Furthermore, if Beverley could encourage the settlement of the region without assistance from the government, the purchase of patents from Beverley would mean revenue for the colony through quit rents and other land taxes, without the

[11] Ibid., 176-177.
[12] Breen, *Tobacco Culture*, 41-44.
[13] Beverley, "Will of William Beverley," 297-298.

expenditures associated with settling the region themselves.[14] One way the Gooch lured settlers to the Blue Ridge was with an exemption from taxes on land for ten years if they moved into Blue Ridge.[15] Settlements on Beverley land would not be producing revenue to the colony initially, but the government hoped that after ten years the region would have enough settlers to generate a sizable revenue stream. Beverley was motivated by the desire to increase his own personal wealth, and would put in his own time and money to settle the region. Beverley's speculation would benefit the Beverleys and Virginia.

An environmental crisis may have sparked Beverley's interest in the Blue Ridge region. A drought in 1737 threatened the livelihood of many the Tidewater gentry. In a letter to Captain James Patton, an Irishman that worked closely with Beverley on the development of his grant, in 1737, Beverley stated that "we have had and it still continues such a drought that has not been known here by any man alive…"[16] Beverley also asked Patton to encourage immigrants from Ireland to come as settlers to his land in the Blue Ridge. Beverley had problems with crops and needed land settlement to pick up in the Blue Ridge; however, in 1738 Patton himself possessed the only patents issued from the Beverley grant.[17] It is important to note that while circumstances for Blue Ridge development looked grim, Patton was able to establish settlements of Scots-Irish and Germans on Beverley's land; however, this success was not yet realized in 1738. To make matters worse, 1738 also witnessed a violent Indian attack on Beverley Manor, as tensions between the Iroquois and Catawba escalated.[18]

---

[14] Beverley, *The History of Virginia*, 200-201.
[15] Heninig, *Statutes at Large*, 71-72.
[16] Beverley to Captain James Patton, Scotland, August 8th 1737, in "Some Letters of William Beverley," 226.
[17] Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia*, 40-41.
[18] Ibid., 162-163.

Beverley was not alone in his difficulties in attracting settlers, and there are several reasons why this stagnant pattern occurred. There was some increase in violence, although the Blue Ridge was still significantly less violent than the Pennsylvanian frontier from which most of the settlers migrated. An increase in violence did give more impact to the settlers' desire for a better organized militia, as would be possible under smaller county jurisdictions. In addition to violence, there are some indicators that economic life in the region was difficult, in part due to the isolation of the settlers from the trade in the east.[19] There was also the Fairfax controversy, which had shaken the settlers' confidence in the legitimacy of the land patents within the region. All of these issues contributed to the lack of growth in the Blue Ridge after the creation of Orange County, and it occurred at a time when the leaders of Virginia were very much invested in the region's development. With one of their own in place, they initiated a plan that outlined the requirements for the creation of Augusta County, and in the process created a system that would have an impact on county creation throughout the backcountry.

In November of 1738, the Assembly issued *An Act, for erecting two new Counties, and Parishes; and granting certain encouragements to the Inhabitants thereof.*[20] This measure would divide Orange County along the Blue Ridge Mountains and create the new counties of Augusta and Frederick. At the heart of Augusta County was Beverley Manor. Of note is that this Act did not immediately create a new county; rather, it set a list of requirements that must be completed before the county could exist. Beverley's presence in the area allowed the

[19] Ibid., 156-158.
[20] Hening, *Statutes at Large*, 78-80.

government to conceive a plan for the development of the Blue Ridge before expansion further west became possible. What the members of the Assembly created in 1738 was a blueprint for backcountry integration into Virginian society and government.

Under section three of the Act, the Assembly listed its greatest requirement. Orange County would remain intact "until it shall be made [to] appear to the governor and council, for the time being, that there is a sufficient number of inhabitants for appointing justices of the peace, and other officers, and erecting courts therin…" [21] The Assembly recognized the problems associated with a scarce Blue Ridge population. First, it would not provide the necessary protection from Indian attack. Second, such a small population could not contribute meaningful revenue for the colony. Finally, this population would not help the colony counter Fairfax's claims in the still ongoing boundary dispute. The Assembly stated its intention to appoint the future members of county government, specifically the Justices of the Peace and the Officers of the court. Not only would the Blue Ridge have to see an increase in settlers, they would have to be, in part, the right kind of settlers to fill these important offices.

Conflict and profit in the region demonstrated the need for local counties. Yet, if these settlers were going to be responsible for the local militia and exertion of colonial will, Virginia's leaders would need to attract men they could influence to the area. One example of this was the employment of John Lewis, already in Beverley Manor, to oversee a militia in the region.[22] Even though he was an Irish immigrant, he was under the watchful eye of William Beverley, which made him more likely to act in accordance with the leadership of the colony. Richard Beeman, in his case study of Lunenburg County, mentions this idea of recruiting a diverse

[21] Hening, *Statutes at Large,* 79.
[22] Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia,* 165.

population and yet retaining gentry influence as the main way to integrate the backcountry into the rest of Virginia.[23] This diversity is a key factor in Virginia's success in backcountry development.

Next, the Act determined a time when the county court would be held. This was important to the settlers who had petitioned for access to county courts for over a decade. More significantly, the Act declared an intention for "the better encouragement of aliens; and the more easy naturalization of such who shall come to inhabit there."[24] Under this declaration, the settlers could have the same access to county courts as their Tidewater counterparts after they became naturalized. The Act gave the governor the power to grant full naturalization to anyone who would swear an oath at the county court and could obtain the record to prove it.[25] This action encouraged settlers, many of whom were immigrants, to migrate into the Blue Ridge. Governor Gooch had attempted to settle the region for most of his career, but not until this Act provided an incentive to immigrants did the population surge, though these non-English newcomers did not receive a commitment to complete equality with the gentry. In addition, this legislation gave the inhabitants of the Blue Ridge more of a personal investment in the interests of the colony. The Assembly thought that if the settlers were given the idea they could become English subjects, they might be more sympathetic to colonial issues and less likely to promote their own self-interest. Since this Act did still include a screening process, Virginians were still in control of the area, especially if they had influence over the county courts.

In the final section of the Act, the Assembly explained how the new members of the county governments would be chosen. The Governor would choose, with the support of the

---

[23] Beeman, *The Evolution of the Southern Backcountry*, 23-24.
[24] Hening, *Statutes at Large*, 79.
[25] Ibid, 80.

Council, a group of county residents from whom the vestry would be elected.[26] Since the county government, especially in the backcountry, was linked to the Anglican Church, the ability for the settlers to become vestrymen was important. This also gave the gentry control of the county creation from the bottom up. No one could go into local county government without the careful consideration of the elite. While the control exerted by the Assembly was much more explicit in this Act than it would be in many others, its spirit influenced county creation from Augusta forward. With this level of control and integration, Virginia was better suited to accommodate involvement in county government than the Carolinas or Pennsylvania.

Even after the issuance of this Act, the settlers expressed their discontent, especially after they learned that county creation would be delayed until the Assembly felt sufficient settlement had occurred. For those who became residents of Frederick County, the act only encouraged them to petition for the rapid county creation. In one such petition, written in 1739, settlers cited the distance they had to travel to attend a county court. The petition mentioned that "many crimes go unpunished," because of the travel involved in prosecuting cases at court, but was also careful to point out that the settlement was still flourishing.[27] If the petition were to be effective, it was important that the settlers not appear to be lawless or unable to maintain order, while they also declared the reasons county government was crucial in the Blue Ridge. Yet the petitions were not effective; the Assembly simply rejected them.

The process of integrating the Blue Ridge into Virginia's political structure, did not work

[26] Ibid.,80.
[27] *Calendar of Virginia State Papers,* 233.

quite as well as the Assembly had hoped. Even though the Virginian backcountry would be considered one of the most fortunate in the colonies, in comparison to their neighbors, participation in government was not as active as it was in the rest of the colony after the new counties were created.[28] Much of this can be explained by the motivation for the settlers to have government in the Blue Ridge. Many of the settlers had spent years in isolation from the colony. They had developed their own economic systems and social structures. Access to county courts was important to these settlers because they needed a way to settle civil disputes and civil matters such as land sales and wills. They were not very concerned over the price of tobacco, as were most of the Tidewater colonists, because they were not as dependent on the staple. Therefore they were less likely to participate in things like colony wide elections where tobacco legislation dominated. Similarly, local counties provided access to local militias, which were important for the protection of the settlements. The settlers were not as concerned with the protection of the colony as a whole.

Even though the Assembly initiated county government in the Blue Ridge, they were unable to quell the mounting hostility within the region.[29] Settlers grew angrier with the colonial government for the lack of protection from Indian attack. The recent incident at Beverley Manor demonstrated the need for some action to be taken. John Lewis was unable to protect settlers from being killed as part of an Iroquois raid, because he did not have the proper weapons or militia organization.[30] Indian relations in the backcountry had to be dealt with if the gentry hoped to continue in the development of the Blue Ridge. These elite gentlemen had determined that the inhabitants must prove their ability to maintain order, and yet they were unable to

[28] Beeman, *The Varieties of the Political Experience,* 165.
[29] Hofstra, *Planting of New Virginia,* 166-167.
[30] Ibid., 162-163.

manage the violence and disorder of the region all by themselves. Only in 1745 were Augusta County and Frederick County finally created, after Governor Gooch helped negotiate the Treaty at Lancaster, which resolved some of the Indian conflict in the region. [31] This treaty made the Blue Ridge safe to settle.

Despite the fact that it took seven years after the initial passage of the Act to formally create the counties of Augusta and Frederick, the involvement of colonial officials in the region had increased significantly from the involvement in Spotsylvania County in 1722. As the first massive migration west in colonial Virginia, the plan and execution of settlements in the Blue Ridge were a learning experience for the government. Some of the inaction, especially initially, created a mistrust of the government that could have been avoided with a more swift integration of the Blue Ridge inhabitants into society. Settlers had petitioned for years for smaller counties that would enable them to visit their county courts with greater ease, have more economic autonomy, set up a better system of self defense, and become more active members of Virginian society in general. Until the gentry began to see the potential to further their own interest in the region, these petitions were met with silence. Other policies, such as the extension of religious toleration and naturalization of immigrants, allowed the colony to develop a backcountry that functioned efficiently. Although this religious development occurred under the eye of the Anglican gentry, the ability to set up churches within settlement communities that were more tied to the inhabitants' actual religious culture was a gift. This policy of religious tolerance allowed the government to lure settlers from the Pennsylvania frontier into the Blue Ridge.

[31] Ibid., 167-169.

When Governor Spotswood first delivered his speech to the Assembly in 1720, he was in a position to change the attitudes towards western expansion. He faced a dysfunctional government that had no interest in western expansion. Instead, members of the Assembly were focused on their plantations and land policy east of the Blue Ridge. He held personal interest in the region and allowed that to fuel his fight for settlements along the Blue Ridge. After the establishment of the first Blue Ridge settlements, however, gentry interest in the region was as slow to develop as the creation of county jurisdictions. In 1736, however, the Fairfax dispute acted as a catalyst for gentry interest. This legal battle accelerated the creation of Orange County. It also introduced the presence of William Beverley into the Blue Ridge. With a Tidewater gentleman available to influence local development, the diversity of the Blue Ridge could be looked at as an asset rather than a setback. The gentry would never see the inhabitants as their equals, but they would utilize the diverse population to fuel continued western land speculation.

Lessons learned from the creation of counties within the Blue Ridge can be seen in the development of different counties throughout the rest of the backcountry.[32] County creation in the Blue Ridge was significant because it occurred so slowly. Yet through that process of careful county development, a broader land policy was developed. A policy based on a partnership between private initiative and public policy. By the time Augusta and Frederick County were created in 1745, a passion for land speculation had arrived in Virginia, and the colony was prepared to accommodate this new chapter of Virginian life. County creation may have been a slow and complicated process in the Blue Ridge, but the effects of its struggle were to demonstrate to the gentry how it could be implemented. As a result the colony could continue

[32] Beeman, *The Evolution of the Southern Backcountry*, 14-41.

their movement of western settlement, without complications of county development.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Beverley, Robert. *The History of Virginia, in Four Parts*. 1722. Reprint, Richmond: H.K. Ellyson's Steam Presses, 1855.

Beverley, William. "Some Letters of William Beverley." edited by Worthington Chauncey Ford. *The William and Mary Quarterly* 3, no. 4 (April, 1895): 223-239. http://www.jstor.org/stable/51915286.

Beverley, William. "Will of William Beverley." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 22, no. 3 (July, 1914): 297-301. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4243366.

Byrd, William. *The London Diary, 1717-1721, and other writings.* edited by Louis B. Wright and Marion Tinling. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958.

Byrd, William. *The History of the Dividing Line and Other Tracts.* Vol. 1, 1866. Reprinted, Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1982. https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=vHQJAQAAIAAJ&pg=GBS.PP7.

Calendar of Virginia State Papers and Other Manuscripts 1652-1781, Vol. 1, edited by WM. P. Palmer. Richmond: R.F. Walker,1875. https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=pKwFAAAAQAAJ&pg=GBS.PP17.

"Documents Relating to the Boundaries of the Northern Neck." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 28, no. 4 (October, 1920): 297-318. http//www.jstor.org/stable/4243784.

Fry, Joshua. *A map of the most inhabited part of Virginia containing the whole province of Maryland with part of Pensilvania, New Jersey and North Carolina.* (London, 1755) Library of Congress. http://www.loc.gov/item/74693088/

"Governour Spotswood's Speech to the Assembly of Virginia, November, 3 1720." *The American Weekly Mercury* (January 31, 1721). American Newspapers Database.

Hening, William Waller. *The Statutes at Large; Being a Collection of All of the Laws of Virginia, From the First Session of the Legislature in the year 1619,* 5 vols. Richmond: Franklin Press, 1819-1823.

https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=G6ETAAAAYAAJ&pg=GBS.PA5.

Journal of the House of Burgesses, 1730. Williamsburg, VA: William Parks, 1730. Early Eighteenth-Century Collections Online Database.

Journal of the House of Burgesses, 1732. Williamsburg, VA: William Parks, 1732. Early Eighteenth-Century Collection Online Database.

Journal of the House of Burgesses, 1738. Williamsburg, VA: William Parks, 1738. Early Eighteenth-Century Collection Online Database.

Keith, William. "To His Excellency, Col Spotswood, Governor of Virginia, the Memorial of William Keith, Governor of Pennsylvania." *Pennsylvania Gazette*. (April 1721). American Newspapers Database

McIlwain, H. R., ed. *Legislative Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia,* Vol 2, Richmond. https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=Kp5WAAAAYAAJ&pg=GBS.PA585.

Privy Council. "Right and Honourable Thomas Lord Fairfax petitioner, Against, The Governor and Council of Virginia in Right of the Crown Defendants." (London: 1745). Early Eighteenth-Centuries Collection Online Database.

Spotswood, Alexander Lieutenant Governor. *The Official Letters of Alexander Spotswood, Lieutenant Governor of the colony of Virginia,1710-1722: Now First Printed From the Manuscript in the Collections of the Virginia Historical Society,* edited by R.A. Brock. Richmond: WM Ellis Jones Printer, 1923. https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=tAvVAAAAMAAJ&pg=GBS.PR4.

Warner, John. *A survey of the northern neck of Virginia, being the lands belonging to the Rt. Honourable Thomas Lord Fairfax Baron Cameron, bounded by & within the Bay of Chesapoyocke and between the rivers Rappahannock and Potowmack: With the courses of the rivers Rappahannock and Potowmack, in Virginia, as surveyed according to order in the years 1736 & 1737.* (n.p. 1747) Library of Congress. http://www.loc.gov/item/99446122/

Secondary Sources

Aull, Edward. *Early History of Staunton and Beverley Manor in Augusta County, Virginia.* The Rucker Agee Collection. Sykesville, MD: Bayside Books of Maryland, 1963.

Beeman, Richard. *The Evolution of the Southern Backcountry.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984.

Beeman, Richard R. *The Varieties of the Political Experience in Eighteenth Century America.* 2004. Reprint, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.

Breen, T.H. *Tobacco Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Dowd, Gregory Evans. *War Under Heaven: Pontiac,the Indian Nations, and the British Empire.* 2001. Reprint, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004.

Frantz, John B. "The Religious Development of the Early German Settlers in 'Greater Pennsylvania': The Shenandoah Valley of Virginia." *Pennsylvania History* 68, no. 1, Pennsylvania Germans, Part One (Winter, 2001): 66-100. http://www.jstor.org/stable/27774312.

Greene, Jack P. "The Opposition to Lieutenant Governor Alexander Spotswood 1718." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 70, no.1, Part One (January, 1962): 35-42. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4246810.

Hinke, William J. "1714 Colony of Germanna, Virginia." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 40, no. 4 (October, 1932): 317-327. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4244476.

Hofstra, Warren R. "Land, Ethnicity, and Community at the Opequon Settlement, Virginia, 1730-1800." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 98, no. 3 (July, 1990):423-448. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4249163.

Hofstra, Warren R. *The Planting of New Virginia, Settlement and Landscape in the Shenandoah Valley.* 2004. Reprint, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2006.

Hofstra, Warren R. "Searching for Peace and Prosperity." *Ulster to America: the Scots-Irish Migration Experience, 1680-1830.* edited by Warren Hofstra. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2011.

Hofstra, Warren R. "The Virginia Backcountry in the Eighteenth Century: The Question of Origins and the Issue of Outcomes." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 101, no. 4 (October, 1993): 485-508.

Holton, Woody. *Forced Founders: Indians, Debtors, Slaves, and the Making of the American Revolution in Virginia.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.

McCleskey, Turk. "Rich Land, Poor Prospects: Real Estate and the Formation of a Social Elite in Augusta County, Virginia, 1738-1770." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 98, no. 3 (July, 1990):449-486. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4249164.

Merrell, James H. "The Indians' New World: The Catawba Experience." *The William and Mary Quarterly* Third Series, 41, no. 4 (October, 1984): 537-565. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1919153.

Miller, David. "Cultural Baggage." *Ulster to America: the Scots-Irish Migration Experience, 1680-1830.* edited by Warren Hofstra. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2011.

Mitchell, Robert D. *Commercialism and Frontier: Perspectives on the Early Shenandoah Valley.* Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1977.

Mitchell, Robert D. "Shenandoah Valley Frontier." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 62, no. 3 (September, 1972): 461-486. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2562299.

Morgan, Edmund S. *American Slavery, American Freedom.* New York: W.W. Norton, 2003.

Otterness, Philip. *Becoming German, the 1709 Palatine Migration to New York.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004.

Smith, Stanley Phillips. "The Northern Neck's Role in American Legal History." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 77, no. 3 (July, 1969): 277-290. http://jstor.org/stable/4247485.

Tillson, Albert H. Jr. "The Militia and Popular Political Culture in the Upper Valley of Virginia, 1740-1775." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 94, no. 3 (July, 1986): 285-306. http://jstor.org/stable/4248892.

Titus, James. *The Old Dominion at War: Society, Politics and Warfare in Late Colonial Virginia.* Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1991.

Waddell,Joseph A. *Annals of Augusta County, from 1726-1871*. 2nd edition (Digital Harvard College Library, n.p.) https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=rZbEC1kEdpcC&pg=GBS.PP2

Wayland, John Walter. “The Germans of the Valley.” *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 9, no. 4 (April, 1902): 337-352. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4242456.